

Some of the Stumbling-Blocks in the Path of Peace

Red Hungary

Bolshevism

Fiume

"WHEN the Paris conference met, Bolshevism was still east of the Dnieper; to-day it is west of the Danube." In these words Frank H. Simonds characterizes a situation that reached its climax last week with the proclamation of a Hungarian soviet republic, which lost no time in declaring its solidarity with the Bolshevik government of Russia.

According to the dispatches, Count Karolyi, Provisional President of Hungary since last October, himself turned over the government to the Communists, issuing a statement in which he said: "I turn as against the Paris peace conference to the proletariat of the world for justice and support." The immediate occasion for the upheaval which makes Hungary the out-

letting in Hungary, a process furthered by Russian emissaries, but also by the general despair over the partition of the country and by famine conditions at Budapest caused by the stoppage of all kinds of supplies from the regions invaded by Czechoslovaks, Rumanians and Jugo-Slavs.

The majority of American commentators are inclined to doubt the sincerity of the proceedings at Budapest, and to view the setting up of Soviet rule as a bluff to exact better conditions of peace, or as a trick instigated by Germans, or both. On the other hand, they recognize the danger that will threaten Europe if Bolshevism really is to gain a foothold in the Danube basin, and they construe the latest events as a warning to the peace conference against further delay.

"The Philadelphia Public Ledger" headlines its editorial "The Hungarian Overturn—A German Overture?" and says: "We know how Germany expects to win the peace. The Hungarian swing to Bolshevism looks like a trial trip. . . . Possibly Germany has sent Hungary in ahead to find out."

"Dilly-dallying" and "do-nothingness" at Paris are blamed by "The Detroit Free Press," while "The Utica Press" warns that "the whole performance in Hungary is suspiciously like an attempt to intimidate the peace conference and the people of Western Europe, and to compel a change in the purpose to free the Rumanians of Transylvania from Magyar oppression."

"The Philadelphia Inquirer" fears that "we are at the beginning of a new campaign which will result in the occupation of far-flung European capitals." According to "The Cleveland Plain Dealer," on the other hand, the situation is not nearly so bad as it looks, since "the Budapest fulmination of war against the democracies is mere bombast." And, finally, "The Brooklyn Daily Eagle" avers that "if the revolt of Hungary has the effect of arousing the peace conference from its leisurely consideration of less important matters than the salvation of Europe from anarchy it may be more beneficial than otherwise."



R-K-Revenge, or How to Foil the Police
—From The Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

post of Bolshevism in the very heart of mid-Europe seems to have been an order of the Allied high command fixing the boundary line between the Magyar republic and Rumania in a manner held by the Magyars to menace their vital interests. For several weeks the cables reported the ripening of Communist



"The ill-defined but yet certain figure of beaten Pan-Germanism ever looms behind the great and cruel beast of Bolshevism. Let us beware lest, in the overwhelming aspect of the monster, we lose sight of the fiend who drove and still drives him on."
—Ruemackers, in The Bystander.

"Bolshevism Is Advancing, While the Allied Diplomats Debate"

—Frank H. Simonds

WHILE the Allied statesmen at Paris are groping their way toward peace through what appears an interminable maze of delays and theorizings, misunderstandings and side issues, in the East events are brewing which may render illusory all settlements and treaties eventually reached. The terror of Bolshevik imperialism, of proletarian world conquest, is looming in a more menacing form than ever.

For some time there have been rumors that Lenin and Trotsky are planning what, in the terminology of the old militaristic regime, one would call a general spring offensive. Maybe the Bolsheviks have another name for it—something with world freedom in it, perhaps. Nevertheless, the substance of the thing is the same, if the reports of the Paris correspondent of "The New York Herald" don't exaggerate:

"Leon Trotsky's staff is preparing a vast European invasion by his Bolshevik hordes as soon as spring weather permits."

"The Russian soviet government has nearly 1,000,000 men under arms, the same information stated. Reports in the hands of the peace conferees, it was added, show where these forces are at present. They indicate that Trotsky now has more than 500,000 troops ready for the advance into Western Europe. My informant said it has been proved that the Bolshevik monster is coiled and ready to strike at the very heart of Europe and even beyond."

The power of Bolshevism in Russia



Tying Him Up.

—From The Milwaukee Sentinel.

proper has been steadily growing lately: "The growing strength of Bolshevism there and the Trotsky military plans to invade Europe by way of Poland have caused the supreme council of the peace conference and certain peace conference agencies to lay aside other pressing prob-



The Soviet!

—From The Kansas City Post.

lems to take care of the situation resulting from the Polish-Ukrainian armistice break. This rupture threatens an irreparable crippling of Poland, one of our allies, unless we send quick military aid to her.

"Every report here indicates that Poland now is in sore distress. Poland today presents the only obstacle the Allies can interpose against Trotsky and his hordes if the Bolsheviks assume the offensive. Hence the increased worry here over the failure to settle the Ukrainian dispute."

This correspondent reports, furthermore, that not only Rumania, but even Czechoslovakia, hitherto thought reasonably safe, have been penetrated by the Bolshevik doctrine. Trotsky, he says, will soon be ready to strike with a million men at Poland, whose morale also has been undermined by Bolshevik infiltration.

"The Brooklyn Daily Eagle" is chiefly concerned about the events in the Ukraine, which are believed to foreshadow the conquest of all the Russias by the Bolshevik duumvirate. It declares:

"Recapture of most of Ukraine by Bolshevik forces again brings the Russian problem to the fore with dramatic suddenness. It is hardly necessary to credit stories of Trotsky's plans for the invasion of Western Europe through Poland to realize that the situation confronting the Allies is serious. French as well as Greek and anti-Bolshevik Ukrainian troops have been driven from Kieff, Zhitomir, Nikolaiev

and finally from Odessa. This is by far the most important success achieved by Trotsky and Lenin, and it has a sinister look."

"Once secure in their hold on Ukraine, the Bolshevik regime may be able to maintain itself indefinitely. Ukraine means food for Bolshevik Russia, and food means more than anything else."

Another menacing phase of the situation is pointed out by "The Buffalo Express":

"President Wilson's bewildering policy toward Russia is beginning to bear fruit—fruit with an extremely sour taste. Word comes from Vladivostok of an intense anti-American feeling growing in eastern Siberia, due largely to the policy, or, rather, lack of policy, in our military operations."

Summing up the situation, with its sinister outlook and its ever increasing tokens of alarm, Frank H. Simonds declares:

"We have two enemies in Europe where we had one enemy four months ago. Germanism, which was crushed, is reviving; Bolshevism, which was a mere distant threat confined in the main to the Muscovite section of the old Romanoff empire, now has crossed the Carpathians and reached the shores of the Danube."

"It remains to be seen whether the belief of many well informed people that Germanism is prompting Bolshevism still as in the past is accurate or not, but more and more it begins to be the belief in Europe that German patriots and German soldiers are encouraging the attack of Bolshevism upon the Entente in the hope that Germany may regain her position in the world when Bolshevism has completed the exhaustion of the Western Powers."



The Aftermath.

—From The Philadelphia Inquirer.

AMONG the numerous territorial problems that the peace conference is called upon to solve none is more entangled than the question of the Adriatic, where the conflicting claims of Italy and Jugo-Slavia involve the most intricate considerations of national self-determination, historic rights, commercial necessities, military and naval security and titles based on the inter-Allied treaty of 1915. And that the most difficult part of this difficult task is the settlement of the Fiume question was brought home forcibly to Allied statesmen and public opinion by the notice served by the Italian Premier Orlando that unless Fiume is assigned to Italy the Italian delegation will withdraw from the Paris negotiations.

The treaty of London, concluded in 1915 by Britain, France and Italy, assigned to the last named power the southern or Italian section of the Tyrol, beside Trieste, Gorizia, Gradisca, Istria and part of the Dalmatian littoral. It did not include Fiume and the Croatian coast, which by implication were to fall to the lot of the greater Serbian, or, as it is now called, Jugo-Slav state. Against this arrangement violent protests have been raised by the spokesmen of the Jugo-Slavs, who contend that Dalmatia, where the Italians form less than 5 per cent of the population, is an integral part of the Jugo-Slav state. The Italian character of Trieste is recognized by all but a few irreconcilables, and although it is pointed out that the hinterland of this important port is overwhelmingly Slavonic, there is a disposition not to push the Jugo-Slav claims in this region.

On the other hand, in the Fiume question both contestants seem to be determined to "go the limit." The Jugo-Slav proposal to refer the settlement to President Wilson was indignantly rejected by the Italians, who assert that there is no such thing as the Fiume question, the city being indisputably Italian by history, language, race, sentiment and by the formal expression of the will of inhabitants.

The two sides of the controversy have been set forth in two articles published in a recent number of "L'Europe Nouvelle," the French weekly devoted to international relations. On the Italian side, Arnaldo Agnelli, member for Milan of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, summarizes the claims for Fiume in the following points:

1. Fiume has been an Italian community throughout its history of more than 1,000 years. Since the middle ages it constituted a self-governing city-republic and its autonomous character was always respected, both by the Hapsburgs and Magyars. In 1776 it was joined, not to Croatia, but to Hungary, still as an autonomous unit under the Magyar crown, on an equal footing with the two other constituent parts, Hungary proper and the Croat kingdom. In 1848 it was annexed to Croatia, but in 1868 reunited to Hungary, with an express guarantee of its autonomy. On October 18, 1918, its deputy in the Hungarian diet declared the unalterable determination of the population of Fiume to be united to the Italian kingdom. Even under the regime of Mag-

yarization the official language of the city was Italian.

2. Out of a population of 48,000, the Italians number 27,000, the Croats 15,000, the Magyars and Germans 6,000. Social and commercial life, schools, theatres and press are overwhelmingly Italian.

3. After the collapse of the Hapsburg monarchy the government of the city was taken over by the Italian National Council, which declared immediately the union with Italy.

4. The commercial importance of Fiume rests on its being the only sea outlet for Hungary, and the Hungarians have emphatically declared their preference for an Italian as against a Jugo-Slav régime.

5. The Jugo-Slavs claim Fiume on the ground of economic necessity, maintaining that the port is the main trade outlet for Croatia. As a matter of fact, Jugo-Slavia will possess a number of excellent harbors on the Dalmatian coast; moreover, the commercial rights of Croatia will be guaranteed under Italian sovereignty.

The Jugo-Slav argument is summed up by Milorad Zebitch, who says that:

1. Even though the Italians have the majority in Fiume proper, the proportion is reversed if we count the inseparable suburb of the city, Susak, which is exclusively Slav. So is the immediate hinterland.

2. That Fiume forms geographically and ethnically an integral part of Croatia and that the Italian character of the city throughout the last fifty years was merely a superficial result of the Magyar-Croat struggle for its possession, inasmuch as



—From The Washington Evening Star.

the Magyars supported the Italian minority against the, for them, more dangerous Slav element.

3. That the Italian National Council had not the right to declare Fiume's union with Italy, as the city came under the jurisdiction of the Croatian National Council at Zagreb after the dissolution of the Hapsburg monarchy.

American editorial opinion appears, on the whole, to favor the Italian claim and to approve the stand taken by the Italian delegation at Paris.

"The Toledo Blade" does not blame Italy for not consenting to the "cutting of her own throat," and "The Washington Post" agrees that the people of Fiume are perfectly justified in demanding, on the "principle of self-determination," that they shall be joined to Italy.

On the other hand, "The Philadelphia Press" is emphatic in denouncing the Italian course:

"Italy's ultimatum appears to be out and out defiance of the supreme council. It is the culminating episode of Italy's recalcitrancy."

Irish Storm Signals

IRELAND has had a pronounced habit of cropping up unexpectedly in the last four years. Germany bet on the Emerald Isle as a disturbing factor in the late summer of 1914. How near German intelligence came to being right probably will never be known. Later came the declaration of a republic and bloodshed in Dublin. Still later a British officer neatly evaded the censor by summing up the situation in three words: "Ireland is Ireland." Now that the peace conference has discovered that Ireland is still Ireland in spite of the war, the world is wondering what the peace conference will do about it. This question even disturbed the serenity of a White House dinner and later caused an amusing addition to "The Congressional Record." As far as Ireland is concerned, officials of the most recent republic are certain of one thing: The peace conference must recognize Ireland—or there will be trouble. In any event, Ireland will be Ireland.

Although Ireland is one of the stumbling-blocks at the conference, some writers take a rosy view of her present situation. E. J. Gannon, writing in "The San Francisco Bulletin," remarks that Ireland never occupied the position of advantage that she does today:

"The slogan of the brilliant Executive of the United States, 'Self-determination for the small nations of the world,' has been adopted by the Irish people, and their claim to nationhood has been prepared for consideration by the peace conference, backed by the enthusiastic approval of the United States House of Representatives and thousands of prominent Americans who remember the wrongs of Irish soldiers who fought so valiantly for America, from Valley Forge to Shenandoah."

The writer is the more irritated by the phrase, "Poor little Ireland, you could stick her in a corner of New York," which, he alleges, is often heard in club circles when the Irish question is under discussion. He says:

"How absurd! Let us compare the area

of Ireland with some of the independent smaller nations of Europe:

	Sq. miles.
Ireland	32,531
Switzerland	15,976
Denmark	15,042
Belgium	15,042

"These figures show that Ireland is almost three times as large as Belgium and larger than Switzerland and Denmark put together."

"Now for population:

Ireland	4,390,219
Switzerland	3,888,500
Denmark	2,940,990
Norway	2,396,782

"We are often told that Ireland has no industries; that all she produces is enough agricultural products to feed her population. Here, again, we will have recourse to the latest statistics. The figures of the combined exports and imports of the following countries for 1915 are taken from Whittaker's Almanac:

Ireland	\$862,068,620
Sweden	375,000,000
Denmark	325,000,000
Norway	210,000,000
Rumania	205,000,000
Portugal	115,000,000
Bulgaria	75,000,000
Greece	62,500,000
Serbia	47,500,000

"The four last mentioned countries have each a larger area and a larger population than Ireland."

Henry Hyde, fresh from Ireland, in an article appearing in "The Chicago Tribune," says that among the British leaders in and out of the government there is an eager and almost painful anxiety to settle the Irish question honestly, fairly and permanently. In Dublin he found both the Sinn Féin executives and the old Nationalists eager to appeal to American public opinion:

"We may say quite frankly that both the Sinn Féins and the Nationalists base their only hope of a speedy settlement of the Irish question on President Wilson. They hope that he will persuade Lloyd George and the British government to bring the Irish question before the peace conference."